

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re JOSE L., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JOSE L.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D068544

(Super. Ct. No. J226667)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Edlene C.

McKenzie, Judge. Affirmed.

James R. Bostwick, Jr. for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

This is an appeal, purportedly from the denial of a motion to seal juvenile records under Welfare and Institutions Code¹ section 786. We note at the outset, however, the motion to seal was granted. The appellate brief presented in this case was filed pursuant

¹ All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), thus there is no contention on appeal that the juvenile court actually denied the minor's request in this case.

The minor, Jose L., was a ward of the juvenile court from October 2010 to October 2014 and placed on probation for several misdemeanor offenses. On June 16, 2015 the juvenile court terminated the minor's probation and granted his request to seal his records under section 786.

Minor's trial counsel filed a notice of appeal from the following order: "06/16/15 denial of motion to seal pursuant to WIC 786."

Since there are no factual issues presented by this appeal we will omit a statement of facts and proceed to the discussion.

DISCUSSION

As we have previously indicated, appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, indicating he has been unable to identify any reasonably arguable issues for reversal on appeal. Counsel asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *Wende*. We offered the minor the opportunity to file his own brief on appeal but he has not responded. In order to comply with *Anders, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, counsel has identified the following possible, but not reasonably arguable issues for our consideration:

1. Whether the minor's motion to seal was granted in whole or in part;

2. Whether, in addition to sealing the records in JDA G5091 (the records subject to the motion in this case), the court should have sealed other records not specified in the motion to seal.

We have reviewed the entire record in this case. We have not identified any reasonably arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented the minor on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The juvenile court's order is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

NARES, J.

McDONALD, J.